

HUMAN RESOURCES BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND AUTHORITARIAN RULE**Abstract**

There is nothing authoritarian in the term “authoritarian resources”. According to Anthony Giddens who offered a universal typology of resources as allocative or authoritarian the latter describes any social order of command in relation to people in temporal contexts, while the former correlates with objects in spatial contexts. Traditional management of personal expressed the irreversible overload with objectifications and now we are facing actual obsession with psychological subjectivities. Thus, we should also look for specific polarizations, which would be more adequate to human resources management (HRM) actual perspectives. That is not about replacing good old objects and subjects, rather to specify the logical space for correlations with HRM instrumental semantic. Communication is always about the ambivalence of social forms and about pragmatic situational equality of communicators (Georg Simmel). Authoritarian rule is now all about administrative dynamics and the ability of administrators to cope with decentralization challenges in modern organizations (nothing to say about infrastructural decentralization happening now in industry 4.0 projects). The new social variable on the rise is the multigenerational factor that is creating unprecedented multi-measurable relations within a company staff. Evidently, HRM now is not some special extra for publicly positioned advanced corporations but rather a challenge for any company survival. Moreover, the globalization adds up other meaningful opportunities, risks, and probably missed advantages in running any viable goal-oriented community nowadays. Finally, the social technologies sphere ‘craves’ for synchronization with versatile forms of mass communication and new aspects of informational inequality as well. Informal social regulation comes forefront as the key emulative resource and a new measurement of the human capital.

Keywords: typology of social resources, organizational decentralization, communicative social forms, informational inequality, multigenerational personnel

Human capital, social technologies, and cultural heterogeneity are vague enough to feed some provocative ideas in modern business education, and at the same time, they are quite specific to be widely applied in modern business practices. Moreover, the ghost of ‘resources’ hangs on wildly over versatile aspects of informational currents which are ubiquitous in the global world. “A particularly important cultural influence that affects the character and pace of change is the nature of communication systems. The invention of writing, for instance, allowed for the keeping of records, making possible increased control of material resources and the development of large-scale organizations” [3, p. 122]. There remains some space for particular organizational variations more or less interesting from the human communication point of view. Notwithstanding the gross fact that inequality rules the social institutions as such, and makes no exclusions for particular organizations, as well as any smaller-scale social or cultural communities, the modernity has a definite diminishing of authoritarian rule on its agenda.

Using the modern classical typology created by A. Giddens, we are facing now the ‘authoritarian’ resources dispassionately complemented by the ‘allocative’ ones. It is better to forget the authoritarian tyrannies, better securing them for the international daily news headlines, and switch our pragmatic imagination to unpredictable from a traditional or classically rational position, move of powers within and between situations of human communication. “For Giddens, action and structure are not opposites but complement each other recursively. The virtual order of structures of meaning, domination and legitimacy is drawn from the interaction of individuals and structures” [4, p. 239]. Human resources rule the world, or, they are at least supposed to do that. Any social order of command in relation to people in temporal contexts constitutes the impersonal power of total inequality as a basis for efficient social emulation and, consequently, civilizational progress.

Moreover, now this inequality gets the approval by cultural tolerance. All historically unimaginable forms of organizational control are flourishing under the name of social technologies, namely, different forms of coaching, training, and team building. Projects, projects, and projects – where are good old instructions that the common sense used to forget quite successfully? Common sense now lives by digital rhythms, which are lethal to any form of privacy in modern human life career. Thus, here comes the personal communication efficiency.

Actually, we are facing an abundance of typologies and classifications called up to clarify and rectify the inevitable overloading of modern human communication within and outside organizations. In addition to this affluence the classical schemata of putting any viable and methodological description of resources management is even more needed from the ‘humanistic’ perspective that is propagated in social technologies’ emulation. The most succinct prototype belongs to the formal sociology paradigm, namely, the configurative descriptive principles developed by Georg Simmel in his analysis of communication. His remarkable characteristics of the communication genesis sounds confidently actual in nowadays: “In fact, it is most remarkable that an event engendered exclusively by natural causes should proceed as if governed by the ideal laws of logic. For, it is exactly as if a tree branch, so connected with a telegraphic apparatus that its movements in the wind set the apparatus in motion, thereby caused signs in it that yield a rational meaning to us” [5, p. 311]. Three aspects of communicative forms express every working opportunity for the qualitative analysis of personal communication efficiency. These are (1) the interdependence of personal perceptions with their actual social forms (statuses, in this case), (2) the inequality of any sum of social forms to the living personality, and (3) the equality of communicating persons despite any non-equivalence of all actual social forms that are interacting with these persons.

My futuristic vision of humanistic vision as the development of structurally and functionally decentralized authoritarian rule is heavily dependent on Simmel’s approach to the forms of communication. Firstly, we need the clearest apprehension of social, psychological, and anthropological distinction as a prerequisite of organizational staff advantage. Secondly, the range of structural, functional, and cultural pattern variables creates nothing but a complex of tools and risks to realize the above-mentioned distinctions as the actual advantage for the organization. Thirdly, the adequately decentralized and dynamically human resources management should non-hypocritically include micro-structural forms of quotidian equality.

Finally, the ‘industry 4.0’ advancement will finally turn to social technological tools, not just doomed to remain the compensation of the drastic infrastructural changes that are due to arrive. ‘Internet of things’, taken from the HRM perspective, is nothing but the consequence of previous mass communication development in modern societies. “Looking at a decentralized organization sheds a different light on the requirement for decentralization by Industry 4.0. It is all about increasingly intelligent processes and the freedom to make decisions – technology plays second fiddle” [2, p. 4.]. Moreover, actualization of dynamic forms of equality in the decentralized structures brings the management back to human diversity within formal scenarios of administration. HRM should be the forefront of liberation from bureaucratic conformity within actual social institutions. Multigenerational teams, their functions and dysfunctions represent perfectly the selection of microstructural forms and scenarios of quotidian interactions. “In the future, new forms of cooperation will allow to flexibly allocate production capacity within a value chain. In order to do so, information needs to be accessible throughout collaborative networks, which poses a lot of potential for conflicts. According to an interviewed purchasing expert, companies usually refuse to disclose information about their production processes and cost structures to their partners to maintain a strong bargaining position” [1, p. 42]. Therefore, symbols, instructions, and algorithms can acquire a chance for survival only through their transformation within non-hypocritical introducing of egalitarian HRM.

Bibliography

1. Brettel M., Friederichsen N., Keller M., Rosenberg M.. How Virtualization, Decentralization and Network Building Change the Manufacturing Landscape: An Industry 4.0 Perspective. International Journal of Mechanical, Aerospace, Industrial, Mechatronic and Manufacturing Engineering Vol: 8, No: 1, 2014. P.37-44
2. Industry 4.0: MES supports Decentralization (Cover story) News International 2015, p. 4. URL: https://www.mpdv.com/uploads/tx_news/NEWS_International_2015_web.pdf
3. Giddens A. Sociology, Sixth Edition, Revised and updated with Philip W. Sutton, Polity, 2009, 1194 p.
4. Macohon E. R., Facin Lavarda C. E. Giddens' Triad in Accounting Research. Revista de Educação e Pesquisa em Contabilidade Journal of Education and Research in Accounting Revista de Educación e Investigación en Contabilidad v. 9, n. 3, art. 1, p. 233-248, Jul/Sep. 2015 Available online at www.repec.org.br DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17524/repec.v9i3.1192>
5. Simmel G. The Sociology of Georg Simmel, translated, edited, and with introduction by Kurt H. Wolff. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois. 445 p.

Ана Кариме Риверо Гаска, Беатрис Рейес Антонио, К. М. Ольховиков
**ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСКИЕ РЕСУРСЫ МЕЖДУ КОММУНИКАЦИЕЙ И АВТОРИТАРНЫМ
УПРАВЛЕНИЕМ**

Аннотация

Нет ничего авторитарного в термине «авторитарные ресурсы». Согласно Энтони Гидденсу, предложившему универсальную типологию ресурсов как аллокативных и авторитарных, последние описывают любой социальный порядок распоряжения в отношении людей и в контексте времени, тогда как первые коррелируют с объектами в пространственных контекстах. Традиционный менеджмент персонала выражал необратимый перегруз объективациями, а сегодня мы сталкиваемся с навязчивостью психологических субъективностей. Таким образом, мы также вынуждены искать специфические поляризации, которые были бы более адекватны актуальным перспективам менеджмента человеческих ресурсов (HRM). Дело не в том, чтобы заменить старые добрые объекты и субъекты, но хотя бы уточнить логическое пространство соответствий для инструментальной семантики HRM. Общение всегда несет в себе амбивалентность социальных форм и прагматическое ситуативное равенство общающихся (Георг Зиммель). Authoritarian rule is now all about administrative dynamics and the ability of administrators to cope with decentralization challenges in modern organizations (nothing to say about infrastructural decentralization happening now in industry 4.0 projects). Авторитарное управление сегодня в целом сводимо к административной динамике и способности администраторов справляться с вызовами децентрализации в современных организациях (не говоря уже об инфраструктурной децентрализации, происходящей в проектах industry 4.0). Многопоколенческий фактор представляет собой новую растущую социальную переменную, создающую беспрецедентные многомерные отношения с кадрами компании. Очевидно, HRM сегодня не просто некая специфическая добавка для публично позиционированных продвинутых корпораций, но вполне составляет вызов выживанию любой компании. Более того, глобализация привносит иные значимые возможности, риски, и вероятные упущенные возможности в управлении любой целеориентированной общности сегодня. Наконец, сфера социальных технологий «жаждет» синхронизации с различными формами массовой коммуникации, а также новыми аспектами информационного неравенства. Неформальная социальная регуляция выходит на первый план в качестве ключевого конкурентного ресурса и нового измерения человеческого капитала.

Ключевые слова: типология социальных ресурсов, организационная децентрализация, коммуникативные социальные формы, информационное неравенство, многопоколенческий персонал.